

It is a tribute as well to our distinguished colleague, Senator BYRD, that he has had the remarkable service of such an outstanding member of his staff over the years. We will all miss Jim very much. We thank him for his extraordinary services to the Senate and the nation, and we extend our best wishes to Jim and his family for a long and happy retirement in the years ahead.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think it is essential that we go forward with our education reform package. A lot of good work has been done in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. Senators on both sides of the aisle—Republican and Democrat—have worked hard. They reported out a bill overwhelmingly from the committee. A great deal of negotiation has gone on since then between members of the committee, the House and Senate, both parties, and the administration. A lot of the reform language has been agreed to, with a lot of understanding about the amount of funds that will be necessary to implement this legislation.

But the important thing is that we go forward. I do not think you could ever get every detail worked out and agreed to in advance. It is called the legislative process. You go to the Chamber, you have debate, you have amendments, you have votes, you get a result, and you pass the bill.

Over the past couple years, I have quite often been criticized that I would not let the Senate work its will. And now, for a week, the Democrats have been blocking going to the bill, blocking the motion to proceed to the education bill.

This is the highest priority for this President, I believe for the Congress, both parties, and for the children.

I believe that if we go forward and have a good debate and have amendments that we will get a result that will be good in improving the quality of education in America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, S. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Reserving the right to object, I say to the majority leader that where I would dissent from his remarks is that actually there is a lot of negotiation going on. I think

Senators on our side have made some very basic points. One is, it is important what is in the bill before it comes to the floor. Two, I think we are quite far apart, although hopefully we at some time will be together about whether or not, in fact, there will be the investment in children, to make sure that the children and the teachers and the schools have the tools to succeed. This is really a choice between whether or not you want to put so much into, I say to the majority leader, Robin-Hood-in-reverse tax cuts, with over 40 percent of the benefits going to the top 1 percent of the population, or you are willing to make the investment in education and children.

I am so pleased the President has announced the goal of leaving no child behind. But it cannot be done on a tin cup budget. We are looking at the whole issue of kids with special needs, the IDEA program, the title I program, afterschool programs, teacher recruitment, smaller class size, and doing something about these dilapidated buildings.

So my hope is we will be able to resolve what I think are important questions. But I think the Democrats are very committed to this discussion about education, very committed to doing it right. If, in fact, we are going to call this piece of legislation, as the President has, the BEST, then we ought to be doing our best for children. I have no doubt that the people in Minnesota and the people across this country are looking for a real commitment of resources and the Federal Government living up to its obligation. We should be accountable. Just as we call for the teachers and the children to be accountable, we should be accountable as well. That is what we are going to be strong on.

I object.

Mr. LOTT. To clarify, does the Senator object to bringing up and going forward with the education bill?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I said I object to going forward with the education bill while we are in negotiation, while we do not know what is in the bill, while we do not have a commitment yet on the investment of resources and the Federal Government and the Senate and the House living up to our commitment to children and education in the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now withdraw the pending motion to proceed to S. 149.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right. The motion is withdrawn.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. I now move to proceed to S. 1, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I say to the Senator from Minnesota, there have been many days of negotia-

tion. A lot of progress has been made. Everybody acknowledges that. But this bill should have been taken up in March. Now here we are almost in May and we are still negotiating. If we are going to have everything wrapped up before it ever comes to the floor of the Senate, there would not be much for the Senate to do around here.

Ordinarily, you get as much of an agreement as you can, get a bill reported out, and bring it to the floor. Negotiations are not going to end. They are going to continue. But on some of them we are not going to be able to reach an agreement.

I say to my colleague, in a State that is trying to improve education, and, again, as a son of a schoolteacher, if just money would solve the problem, we would have a higher quality of education in America than we do today.

We have spent well over \$130 billion over the past several years for the title I program. I don't want to demean that program. It has done some good and can do more good, if we give a little more flexibility at the local level where the money can be used, where it may be used differently in Minnesota than it would be in Texas, give a little flexibility to make sure you are addressing the needs of those title I children in an appropriate way.

But just money is not enough. We have to have some real reforms. Money is part of it. I admit that. The President has asked for more money for the reading program. The President has indicated he supports more funding for title I and for IDEA and for bilingual education.

We are making progress. He is moving in the right direction. But I don't know if we can ever come up with enough money in this area or a lot of the other areas to suit every Senator. They can always find some way—it is easy—to say "give me more."

One of the reasons we ought to have tax relief is to let the people keep a little bit more of their money to help the children with their needs. That is why I think we ought to double the child tax credit; let the parents get more of the benefit of their money to help their children with their needs. Let them decide if they need a little tutoring, if they need a computer, whatever it may be.

One of the reasons parents can't always do what they need for their own children is that they don't get to keep enough of the money they earn. Why in the world would we take from the mouths of labor the bread that they have earned? That is a quote from Thomas Jefferson—a great line.

At any rate, some Senators are adamant about objecting to proceeding to the education bill. I think that is a mistake. I think we ought to move forward. I suspect that some of the amendments that would be offered—and maybe the Senator from Minnesota would support and I would oppose—probably will pass. What are they worried about? We can bring this to a satisfactory conclusion that would be

good for everybody. This is a win-win opportunity. Let's not blow it.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk to the pending motion to proceed so that we can get under way. I have let the Senate basically mark time now for the last week without achieving any real progress or closing the negotiations. I think it is time we guarantee that we can get on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 23, S. 1, an original bill to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965:

Trent Lott, Jim Jeffords, Bill Frist, Rick Santorum, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Don Nickles, Tim Hutchinson, Strom Thurmond, Frank Murkowski, Pat Roberts, Sam Brownback, Jeff Sessions, Mike Crapo, Judd Gregg, Susan Collins, and Jesse Helms.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have consulted with Senator DASCHLE and advised him that I would be filing cloture. This is not a surprise on his part. I know Senator KENNEDY was aware of it. I am sorry he was not on the floor because he has been working very hard doing a good job.

Under the rules, this vote then would occur on Tuesday. I ask unanimous consent that this cloture vote occur at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday and that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I want to make a statement on a recent trip I have made to the Mideast. I want to alert my colleagues to the fact that beyond what is available in the news media, the situation in the Mideast is so serious it is really hard to describe. The concern I have is that the violence is likely to move beyond the borders of Israel where Hamas and Islamic Jihad may be targeting other installations, perhaps even U.S. installations.

I had an opportunity to talk with the Israeli leaders, including Prime Minister Sharon, who has the understandable position that he is not going to negotiate for peace until the violence has ended.

I had an opportunity to talk with Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat, who makes representations which simply are not true. Arafat makes the contention that he has issued an unequivocal edict for the Palestinians to cease the violence, citing as an example a speech he made at the Arab summit. When that speech is examined, it is so conditional as to be meaningless.

We had an opportunity to travel as well to Damascus where conversations were held with Foreign Minister al-Shara.

The situation between Israel and Syria is very tense. Israel retaliated against a Syrian radar installation because of the Hezbollah attacks against Israel from southern Lebanon Hezbollah being backed by Iran with the concurrence of Syria.

The trip I made occurred during the past Easter recess, and I will describe it in some detail in the course of this floor statement.

Upon coming back to the United States, I have written to the President urging him to appoint a special representative in the Mideast, just as that had been the practice going back to the days when Henry Kissinger shuttled for President Nixon, special envoys being appointed by President Jimmy Carter, President Ronald Reagan, President George H. W. Bush, and President Bill Clinton.

Mr. President, from April 7 to April 21, we traveled from New York City to London, Florence, Ashkelon, Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Cairo, Damascus, Beirut, Souda Bay, Crete, and Rome en route to Philadelphia.

In London, we met at the British Ministry of Defense with Ian Lee, the Director of the NATO and European Security Policy Department, and Deputy Director, A. D. Richards. The meeting touched on a range of issues. Among those were President Bush's position on missile defense, the British outreach to rogue nations, the viability of NATO absent a Soviet threat, plans for the proposed European defense force, and the British thoughts on the War Crimes Tribunal and the International Court.

Mr. Lee stated that the British reaction to President Bush's position on Missile Defense and its effect on the ABM Treaty was one of general support. They have an appreciation for the risks and agree with the United States on the threats. However, they are waiting to see what the actual proposal would be.

Mr. Lee stated that the United Kingdom was at a different stage than the United States in regards to its relation with several rogue nations. Its mission in Iran is moving toward having an ambassador, while it continues an effort to establish diplomatic ties to Libya.

I next met with Mr. Emrys Jones Parry, the Political Director and Deputy Undersecretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. Also attending was Mr. Jonathan Darby, the U.S. Desk Officer, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and Mr.

Mort Dworken, the Charge d' Affairs at the American Embassy.

When questioned about the proposed European Defense Force, Mr. Parry offered insight as to why Mr. Blair, who is a strong supporter of NATO, had come out in favor of an European defense force. According to Mr. Parry, Mr. Blair apparently believes that by putting a European flag on the force structure, European nations will be more likely to put money into it as well as spend the money on what they should in a NATO context.

Mr. Parry noted the idea of a European defense force has been around since 1952. He said it is not designed to remove the U.S. from the theater, but make it more likely to have the U.S. there because the Europeans would be pulling more of their own weight.

On the issue of the International Criminal Court, Mr. Parry stated that the U.K. is generally in favor of it. It believes there is a need for a forum to hold those accountable who would otherwise escape justice because of a lack of interest in their home jurisdiction. He was surprised when I told him that War Crimes Tribunal Prosecutor Carla Del Ponte was thinking of indicting General Wesley Clarke and other NATO officers for targeting civilians and for recklessly endangering them in targeting military objectives. Mr. Parry said it was his understanding that that British troops could not come under indictment because of provisions that the United Kingdom would take care of its own.

When I asked why we are putting so much into NATO in light of the loss of the Soviet threat, Mr. Parry replied that NATO's actions in Kosovo show that it is still necessary.

Our conversation then turned to the U.K.'s actions with Iran and Iraq. Mr. Parry noted that Britain was looking to keep a relationship open with the nations, and then if firm action was later required, the relationship could be adjusted accordingly.

I then asked Mr. Parry if the Europeans might eventually be on board the idea of missile defense. He responded that the assumption in Britain was the United States would go ahead and deploy a missile defense system, if it would work. The British position is that they will do what is necessary to ensure its success, but would like it to be "arranged in such a manner as to generate greater solidarity on the issue."

We then had substantive discussions in a working tea with the Baroness Scotland of Asthal QC, the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign & Commonwealth Affairs with ministerial duties including North America. Over tea at the House of Lords, we discussed the American/British relationship. She also described her background and how she came to be in the House of Lords.